



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/710,964	08/15/2004	Yongyong Xu		4963
44642	7590	10/17/2006		
YONGYONG XU 630 SANTA CRUZ TERRACE SUNNYVALE, CA 94085				
EXAMINER MORRISON, JAY A				
ART UNIT			PAPER NUMBER	
2168				

DATE MAILED: 10/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/710,964

Applicant(s)

XU, YONGYONG

Examiner

Jay A. Morrison

Art Unit

2168

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 September 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-101 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 31-59 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 and 60-101 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 August 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/15/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Group I in the reply filed on 8/25/06 is acknowledged. Claims 1-30 and 60-101 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

Claims 1-30 and 84-101 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The claims lack the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or a manufacture within the meaning of 35 USC 101. They are clearly not a series of steps or acts to be a process nor are they a combination of chemical compounds to be a composition of matter. As such, they fail to fall within a statutory category. They are, at best, functional descriptive material *per se*.

Descriptive material can be characterized as either "functional descriptive material" or "nonfunctional descriptive material." Both types of "descriptive material" are nonstatutory when claimed as descriptive material *per se*, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759. When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized. Compare *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994)

Merely claiming nonfunctional descriptive material, i.e., abstract ideas, stored on a computer-readable medium, in a computer, or on an electromagnetic carrier signal, does not make it statutory. See *Diehr*, 450 U.S. at 185-86, 209 USPQ at 8 (noting that the claims for an algorithm in *Benson* were unpatentable as abstract ideas because “[t]he sole practical application of the algorithm was in connection with the programming of a general purpose computer.”).

Claim Objections

2. Claims 1 and 86 are objected to because of the following informalities:
 - a. As per claim 1: “ones of the plurality of users” should be “one of the plurality of users”.
 - b. As per claim 60, line 3: “URL” should be “uniform resource locator (URL)”. Please note that other acronyms appear in the claims and should likewise be corrected as necessary.
 - c. As per claim 83, line 2: “non-disrubutive” should be “non-distributive”.
 - d. As per claim 86: “comprisinga” should be “comprising a”.
 - e. As per claim 101, lines 2-3: “software resides the software resource” should be “software resides in the software resource”.Appropriate correction is required.

Specification

3. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it exceeds the limit of 150 words. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 1-6,11-14,16,18-19,25,27,29,67,70,73-75,78,80-82,85,93 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the plurality of users" in line 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the resource" in line 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "they " in line 6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For purposes of examination it is assumed the Applicant meant "the plurality of users".

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the resource based virtual community" in line 5-6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is noted that the Applicant defines "a plurality of resource based virtual communities", however the particular resource based virtual community chosen from among the plurality is not clear.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the accessed resource" in line 6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is noted that the Applicant defines "a plurality of accessed resources", however the particular accessed resource chosen from among the plurality is not clear.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the resource" in line 6-7. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For purposes of examination it is assumed the Applicant meant "the accessed resource".

Claim 2 recites the limitation "the plurality of resources" in line 1-2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For purposes of examination it is assumed the Applicant meant "the plurality of associated resources".

Claim 3 recites the limitation "the plurality of resources" in line 1-2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For purposes of examination it is assumed the Applicant meant "the plurality of associated resources".

Claim 4 recites the limitation "the plurality of resources" in line 1-2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For purposes of examination it is assumed the Applicant meant "the plurality of associated resources".

Claim 5 recites the limitation "the plurality of resources" in line 1-2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For purposes of examination it is assumed the Applicant meant "the plurality of associated resources".

Claim 6 recites the limitation "they" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For purposes of examination it is assumed the Applicant meant "users".

Claim 6 recites the limitation "the resource" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For purposes of examination it is assumed the Applicant meant "the accessed resource".

Claim 11 recites the limitation "the community" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is noted that the Applicant defines "a plurality of resource based virtual communities", and it can be assumed that the application meant a resource based virtual community, however the particular resource based virtual community chosen from among the plurality is not clear.

Claim 12 recites the limitation "the community" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is noted that the Applicant defines "a plurality of resource based virtual communities", and it can be assumed that the application meant a resource based virtual community, however the particular resource based virtual community chosen from among the plurality is not clear.

Claim 13 recites the limitation "the community" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is noted that the Applicant defines "a plurality of resource based virtual communities", and it can be assumed that the application meant a resource based virtual community, however the particular resource based virtual community chosen from among the plurality is not clear.

Claim 14 recites the limitation "they" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For purposes of examination it is assumed the Applicant meant "the community members".

Claim 14 recites the limitation "the resource" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For purposes of examination it is assumed the Applicant meant "the accessed resource".

Claim 16 recites the limitation "the resources" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For purposes of examination it is assumed the Applicant meant "the plurality of accessed resources".

Claim 18 recites the limitation "the resource server" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 18 recites the limitation "the virtual community" in lines 2-3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is noted that the Applicant defines "a plurality of resource based virtual communities", and it can be assumed that the application meant a resource based virtual community, however the particular resource based virtual community chosen from among the plurality is not clear.

Claim 18 recites the limitation "the resource" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For purposes of examination it is assumed the Applicant meant "the accessed resource".

Claim 19 recites the limitation "the plurality of web resource servers" in lines 1-2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 25 recites the limitation "the community" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is noted that the Applicant defines "a plurality of resource based virtual communities", and it can be assumed that the

application meant a resource based virtual community, however the particular resource based virtual community chosen from among the plurality is not clear.

Claim 27 recites the limitation "the community" in lines 3-4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is noted that the Applicant defines "a plurality of resource based virtual communities", and it can be assumed that the application meant a resource based virtual community, however the particular resource based virtual community chosen from among the plurality is not clear.

Claim 27 recites the limitation "the resource being served" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 29 recites the limitation "the plurality of communities" in lines 2-3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For purposes of examination it is assumed the Applicant meant "the plurality of resource based virtual communities".

Claim 67 recites the limitation "the community" in lines 2-3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 70 recites the limitation "the current status" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 73 recites the limitation "the resource based virtual community" in lines 7-8. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is noted that the Applicant defines "a plurality of resource based virtual communities", however the particular resource based virtual community chosen from among the plurality is not clear.

Art Unit: 2168

Claim 73 recites the limitation "the accessed resource" in line 8. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is noted that the Applicant defines "a plurality of accessed resources", however the particular accessed resource chosen from among the plurality is not clear.

Claim 74 recites the limitation "the resource" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is noted that the Applicant defines "a plurality of accessed resources", however the particular accessed resource chosen from among the plurality is not clear.

Claim 75 recites the limitation "the resource" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is noted that the Applicant defines "a plurality of accessed resources", however the particular accessed resource chosen from among the plurality is not clear.

Claim 75 recites the limitation "the user" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is noted that the Applicant defines "a plurality of users", however the particular user chosen from among the plurality is not clear.

Claim 78 recites the limitation "the resource" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is noted that the Applicant defines "a plurality of accessed resources", however the particular accessed resource chosen from among the plurality is not clear.

Claim 80 recites the limitation "the accessed resource" in lines 5,6, and 7, respectively. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is

noted that the Applicant defines "accessed resources", however the particular accessed resource chosen from among the plurality is not clear.

Claim 81 recites the limitation "the original resource" in line 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 81 recites the limitation "the accessed resource" in line 7. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is noted that the Applicant defines "accessed resources", however the particular accessed resource chosen from among the plurality is not clear.

Claim 82 recites the limitation "the user" in lines 5 and 6, respectively. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is noted that the Applicant defines "a plurality of users", however the particular user chosen from among the plurality is not clear.

Claim 82 recites the limitation "the accessed resource" in line 7. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is noted that the Applicant defines "accessed resources", however the particular accessed resource chosen from among the plurality is not clear.

Claim 82 recites the limitation "the user" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is noted that the Applicant defines "a plurality of users", however the particular user chosen from among the plurality is not clear.

Claim 85 recites the limitation "the user" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is noted that the Applicant defines "a

Art Unit: 2168

plurality of users", however the particular user chosen from among the plurality is not clear.

Claim 93 recites the limitation "the protocol handling chain" in lines 2-3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Note: the art rejections are made given the best understanding given the presented claims, which are difficult to interpret because of the abundance of assumptions were required due to their drafting.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-10,15-19,22,25-28,73-81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pearlman et al. ('Pearlman' hereinafter) ("A community authorization service for group collaboration" by Pearlman, L., Welch, V., Foster, I., Kesselman, C. and Tuecke, S.; Policies for Distributed Systems and Networks, 2002. Proceedings Third International Workshop on 5-7 June 2002; Page(s): 50 - 59).

As per claim 1, Pearlman teaches

A system of resource based virtual communities comprising: (see abstract)
a community server operable to manage a plurality of resource based virtual communities associated with each of a plurality of accessed resources, (communities with resources, section 1)

and operable to connect ones of the plurality of users to the resource based virtual community associated with the accessed resource when they access the resource. (individuals using resources, section 1)

As per claim 2, Pearlman teaches

each of the plurality of resources is associated with a corresponding community.
(sharing rules, section 1)

As per claim 3, Pearlman teaches

each of the plurality of resources comprises a web resource. (section 5)

As per claim 4, Pearlman teaches

each of the plurality of resources comprises a non-web resource. (section 5)

As per claim 5, Pearlman teaches

each of the plurality of resources comprises a unique name. (which service, section 3)

As per claim 6, Pearlman teaches
users automatically become members of the resource based virtual community
associated with the accessed resource when they access the resource unless the users
are required to login to the community server. (authorization, section 3)

As per claim 7, Pearlman teaches
the community server is further operable to provide community services to
community members. (section 3.1)

As per claim 8, Pearlman teaches
the community server is further operable to enable communication between
community members. (collaboration, section 1)

As per claim 9, Pearlman teaches
the community server is further operable to enable community members to
perform community activities. (collaboration, section 1)

As per claim 10, Pearlman teaches
the community server is further operable to provide collaboration between
community members. (collaboration, section 1)

Art Unit: 2168

As per claim 15, Pearlman teaches

the community server is further operable to enable new community services from community members. (individual representing community, section 3.1)

As per claim 16, Pearlman teaches

the resources comprise private resources having a unique name. (which service, section 3)

As per claim 17, Pearlman teaches

the community servers is further operable to provide community member authentication services. (authorization, section 3)

As per claim 18, Pearlman teaches

the community server is provided by the resource server by setting up and serves the virtual community along with the resource. (section 1)

As per claim 19, Pearlman teaches

each of the plurality of web resource servers is operable to contact other community servers to provide community services. (section 3)

As per claim 22, Pearlman teaches

the community server is further operable to uniquely identify each community member across multiple communities. (section 3)

As per claim 25, Pearlman teaches

the community server is further operable to keep statistical information regarding the community. (provide 30% of its resources, section 3)

As per claim 26, Pearlman teaches

the community server is further operable to connect users who have accessed the same resource and users who are accessing the same resource. (section 3)

As per claim 27, Pearlman teaches

a proxy server coupled to the community server and a web resource server, the proxy server operable to serve a web resource content and connect to the community based on the resource being served. (security, section 2)

As per claim 28, Pearlman teaches

the community server is further operable to combine a plurality of communities into a larger community based upon similar topical resources. (section 3)

As per claim 73, Pearlman teaches

Art Unit: 2168

A method of forming resource based virtual communities comprising the steps of:
(see abstract)

providing a community server operable to manage a plurality of resource based virtual communities associated with each of a plurality of accessed resources;

(communities with resources, section 1)

each of a plurality of users accessing the resources; (consumers using resources, section 1)

and each of the plurality of users connecting to the resource based virtual community associated with the accessed resource. (virtual organization using resource, section 1)

As per claim 74, Pearlman teaches

the resource being accessed by the user is a web resource, including a web site, a web page, a newsgroup, or a discussion forum. (section 6)

As per claim 75, Pearlman teaches

the resource being accessed by the user is a non-web resource, including a software product, a bulletin board, a game, an FTP site, a file, an image, a photo, or products that can be shared by users. (FTP, section 6)

As per claim 76, Pearlman teaches

each of the plurality of accessed resources is associated with a corresponding resource based virtual community. (sharing rules, section 1)

As per claim 77, Pearlman teaches
enabling new community services from community members. (resource providers, section 1)

As per claim 78, Pearlman teaches
providing users community information and community services; including hit count, total users, current users, feedback, comments, ratings, reviews, references or other useful information for the resource. (accounting, section 9.1)

As per claim 79, Pearlman teaches
enabling users collaboration with other community members; including making comments, publishing reviews, rating resources, writing notes, sending messages, sharing whiteboards, chatting, helping each other, asking and answering questions, exchanging ideas, interests matching scheduling meetings, online auctions, online dating, broadcasting or other campaigns such as marketing or advertisements.
(collaboration, section 1)

As per claim 80,

each of the plurality of users accessing the resources and resource based communities comprises the steps of: (see abstract)

each of a plurality of users accessing the resources; (section 1)

the accessed resource returning the original resource; (section 1)

and the accessed resource connecting users to the virtual community based on the accessed resource. (section 3)

As per claim 81,

each of the plurality of users accessing the resources comprises the steps of :
(section 1)

each of a plurality of users accessing the resources through a proxy server;
(section 2.2)

the proxy server returning the original resource; (section 2.2)

and the proxy server connecting the user to the virtual community based on the accessed resource. (section 2.2)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 11-14,20-21,24,29-30,60-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pearlman et al. ('Pearlman' hereinafter) ("A community authorization service for group collaboration" by Pearlman, L., Welch, V., Foster, I., Kesselman, C. and Tuecke, S.; Policies for Distributed Systems and Networks, 2002. Proceedings Third International Workshop on 5-7 June 2002; Page(s): 50 - 59) in view of Matthews et al. ('Matthews' hereinafter) (Publication Number 2003/0050986 A1).

As per claim 11,

Pearlman does not explicitly indicate "the community server is further operable to provide notification to community members when a new user joins the community."

However, Matthews discloses "the community server is further operable to provide notification to community members when a new user joins the community" (paragraph [0057]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman and Matthews because using the steps of "the community server is further operable to provide notification to community members when a new user joins the community" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by enhancing interaction between community members. This gives the user the advantage of having a channel for communication between members available.

As per claim 12,

Pearlman does not explicitly indicate “the community server is further operable to enable community members to communicate with users outside the community.”

However, Matthews discloses “the community server is further operable to enable community members to communicate with users outside the community” (email, paragraph [0057]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman and Matthews because using the steps of “the community server is further operable to enable community members to communicate with users outside the community” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by enhancing interaction between community members. This gives the user the advantage of having a channel for communication between members available.

As per claim 13,

Pearlman does not explicitly indicate “the community server is further operable to provide community members with information regarding the community.”

However, Matthews discloses “the community server is further operable to provide community members with information regarding the community” (paragraph [0021]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman and Matthews because using the steps of

Art Unit: 2168

“the community server is further operable to provide community members with information regarding the community” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by enhancing interaction between members of the community. This gives the user the advantage of being able to communicate effectively with community members.

As per claim 14, Pearlman teaches

“the information comprises information presented to the community members while they are accessing the resource. (section 6)

As per claim 20,

Pearlman does not explicitly indicate “the community server is disposed behind a firewall to limit community members to users in an intranet.”

However, Matthews discloses “the community server is disposed behind a firewall to limit community members to users in an intranet” (paragraph [0028]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman and Matthews because using the steps of “the community server is disposed behind a firewall to limit community members to users in an intranet” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by providing security for members of the community. This gives the user the advantage of having their data and community safe from security risks.

As per claim 21,

Pearlman does not explicitly indicate “the community server is further operable to provide user privacy preferences to community members.”

However, Matthews discloses “the community server is further operable to provide user privacy preferences to community members” (block, paragraph [0064]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman and Matthews because using the steps of “the community server is further operable to provide user privacy preferences to community members” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by providing security for members of the community. This gives the user the advantage of having their data and community safe from security risks.

As per claim 24,

Pearlman does not explicitly indicate “the community server is further operable to organize an information content of each virtual community into a plurality of hyperlinked pages.”

However, Matthews discloses “the community server is further operable to organize an information content of each virtual community into a plurality of hyperlinked pages” (paragraph [0021]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman and Matthews because using the steps of “the community server is further operable to organize an information content of each

virtual community into a plurality of hyperlinked pages” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by improving access to information within the community. This gives the user the advantage of having a common browser interface whereby all users can access the pages.

As per claim 29

Pearlman does not explicitly indicate “the community server is further operable to enable searches of each of the plurality of communities.”

However, Matthews discloses “the community server is further operable to enable searches of each of the plurality of communities” (paragraph [0025]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman and Matthews because using the steps of “the community server is further operable to enable searches of each of the plurality of communities” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by improving access to information within the community. This gives the user the advantage of having a common browser interface whereby all users can access the pages.

As per claim 30,

Pearlman does not explicitly indicate “the community server is further operable to provide customized filtering preferences set by users, systems, and communities.”

However, Matthews discloses “the community server is further operable to provide customized filtering preferences set by users, systems, and communities” (paragraph [0025]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman and Matthews because using the steps of “the community server is further operable to provide customized filtering preferences set by users, systems, and communities” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by improving access to information within the community. This gives the user the advantage of having a common browser interface whereby all users can access the pages.

As per claim 60, Pearlman teaches

A global universal virtual community server system for mapping each of a plurality of resources to a virtual community area by resource URL comprising: (see abstract)

a global universal community server including the plurality of virtual community areas, each of a plurality of resource mapped to a virtual community area; (communities with resources, section 1)

and a global user database within the global universal virtual community server that holds all user information for users accessing any of the plurality of resources, ... , the virtual community areas holding community information, data and links related to

each of the users in the global user database. (community authorization service, section 1)

Pearlman does not explicitly indicate "including a user IP address or email address".

However, Matthews discloses "including a user IP address or email address" (email, paragraph [0057]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman and Matthews because using the steps of "including a user IP address or email address" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by enhancing interaction between community members. This gives the user the advantage of having a channel for communication between members available.

As per claim 61, Pearlman teaches
the virtual community areas are stored in directories, files, or databases. (Unix account, section 2.4)

As per claim 62, Pearlman teaches
the global universal virtual community server comprises a group of servers. (CAS server contains entries for servers, section 3)

As per claim 63, Pearlman teaches

the global user database comprises a distributed database. (distributed, section 3.1)

As per claim 64, Pearlman teaches
each virtual community area is created on demand when a first user accesses a resource. (section 9.1)

As per claim 65, Pearlman teaches
the global user database creates a new user record only when a new user entry is queried and is not in the database. (section 3.1)

As per claim 66,
Pearlman does not explicitly indicate “each virtual community area comprises a web server or web pages.”

However, Matthews discloses “each virtual community area comprises a web server or web pages” (paragraph [0021]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman and Matthews because using the steps of “each virtual community area comprises a web server or web pages” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by improving access to information within the community. This gives the user the advantage of having a common browser interface whereby all users can access the pages.

As per claim 67, Pearlman teaches
each virtual community area comprises information regarding the community.
(section 1)

As per claim 68, Pearlman teaches
each virtual community area comprises server side components that support
user and community interactivity and activities. (section 6)

As per claim 69, Pearlman teaches
each virtual community area may utilize server side technologies including server
side script, CGI, Servlet, web services and weblogs. (logs, section 9.1; 'may' denotes an
optionally recited limitation and optionally recited limitations are not guaranteed to take
place and are therefore not required to be taught, see MPEP § 2106 Section II(C))

As per claim 70, Pearlman teaches
the global user database comprises the current status of individual user's
information. (section 1)

As per claim 71, Pearlman teaches
the global user database stores users' personal data including messages from
other users, preferences or privacy and security settings. (section 3)

As per claim 72, Pearlman teaches
the universal community server is operable to group different community areas
together to form a larger community for a bigger scope of resources. (section 3)

8. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over
Pearlman et al. ('Pearlman' hereinafter) ("A community authorization service for group
collaboration" by Pearlman, L., Welch, V., Foster, I., Kesselman, C. and Tuecke, S.;
Policies for Distributed Systems and Networks, 2002. Proceedings Third International
Workshop on 5-7 June 2002; Page(s): 50 - 59) in view of Katzman et al. ('Katzman'
hereinafter) (Publication Number 2002/0046051 A1).

As per claim 23,
Pearlman does not explicitly indicate "the community server is further operable to
track community member's activities with the community member's permission."

However, Katzman discloses "the community server is further operable to track
community member's activities with the community member's permission" (paragraph
[0082]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the
invention was made to combine Pearlman and Katzman because using the steps of "the
community server is further operable to track community member's activities with the

Art Unit: 2168

community member's permission" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by trends to be tracked for future on-line business use. This gives the user the advantage of being able to have the choice of being tracked for future opportunities or other use.

9. Claims 82-101 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pearlman et al. ('Pearlman' hereinafter) ("A community authorization service for group collaboration" by Pearlman, L., Welch, V., Foster, I., Kesselman, C. and Tuecke, S.; Policies for Distributed Systems and Networks, 2002. Proceedings Third International Workshop on 5-7 June 2002; Page(s): 50 - 59) in view of Dinan et al. ('Dinan' hereinafter) (Publication Number 2002/0097267 A1).

As per claim 82, Pearlman teaches

each of the plurality of users connecting to the resource based virtual community associated with the accessed resource comprises the steps of: (see abstract)

Pearlman does not explicitly indicate "a client side software installed to user's computer discovering the resource accessed by the user; and the client side software connecting the user to the virtual community based on the accessed resource."

However, Dinan discloses "a client side software installed to user's computer discovering the resource accessed by the user; and the client side software connecting the user to the virtual community based on the accessed resource" (paragraph [0037]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman and Dinan because using the steps of “a client side software installed to user's computer discovering the resource accessed by the user; and the client side software connecting the user to the virtual community based on the accessed resource” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing the user to become more involved in the community due to improvements in the user experience. This gives the user the advantage of a faster and more complete experience.

As per claim 83,

Pearlman does not explicitly indicate “the user accessing the virtual community along with the accessed resource in a non-disruptive way including using context menus, status bars, popup windows, balloon help messages, task bars to embedded frames inside a current web page.”

However, Dinan discloses “the user accessing the virtual community along with the accessed resource in a non-disruptive way including using context menus, status bars, popup windows, balloon help messages, task bars to embedded frames inside a current web page” (paragraph [0042]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman and Dinan because using the steps of “the user accessing the virtual community along with the accessed resource in a non-disruptive way including using context menus, status bars, popup windows, balloon

Art Unit: 2168

help messages, task bars to embedded frames inside a current web page” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing the user to become more involved in the community due to improvements in the user experience. This gives the user the advantage of a faster and more complete experience.

As per claim 84,

Pearlman does not explicitly indicate “each of the plurality of resources comprises a non-Internet based product including a software, a product, a device, an audio, a video, a service or other commodities.”

However, Dinan discloses “each of the plurality of resources comprises a non-Internet based product including a software, a product, a device, an audio, a video, a service or other commodities” (paragraph [0048]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman and Dinan because using the steps of “each of the plurality of resources comprises a non-Internet based product including a software, a product, a device, an audio, a video, a service or other commodities” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing the user to become more involved in the community due to improvements in the user experience. This gives the user the advantage of a faster and more complete experience.

As per claim 85,

Pearlman does not explicitly indicate “the user connects to the resource based virtual communities through a mobile device including a PDA and a cellular phone.”

However, Dinan discloses “the user connects to the resource based virtual communities through a mobile device including a PDA and a cellular phone” (paragraph [0039]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman and Dinan because using the steps of “the user connects to the resource based virtual communities through a mobile device including a PDA and a cellular phone” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing the user to become more involved in the community due to improvements in the user experience. This gives the user the advantage of a faster and more complete experience.

As per claim 86,

Pearlman does not explicitly indicate “a client side software installable to a user’s computer, the software operable to detect users activity of accessing a resource and connecting to the virtual community based on the accessed resource.”

However, Dinan discloses “a client side software installable to a user’s computer, the software operable to detect users activity of accessing a resource and connecting to the virtual community based on the accessed resource” (paragraph [0037]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman and Dinan because using the steps of “a

client side software installable to a user's computer, the software operable to detect users activity of accessing a resource and connecting to the virtual community based on the accessed resource" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing the user to become more involved in the community due to improvements in the user experience. This gives the user the advantage of a faster and more complete experience.

As per claim 87,

Pearlman does not explicitly indicate "the client side software also provides a toolbar button installable on user's browser operable to connect to the resourced based virtual community when selected by the user."

However, Dinan discloses "the client side software also provides a toolbar button installable on user's browser operable to connect to the resourced based virtual community when selected by the user" (paragraph [0037]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman and Dinan because using the steps of "the client side software also provides a toolbar button installable on user's browser operable to connect to the resourced based virtual community when selected by the user" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing the user to become more involved in the community due to improvements in the user experience. This gives the user the advantage of a faster and more complete experience.

As per claim 88,

Pearlman does not explicitly indicate "the client side software also provides a context menu installable on the user's browser operable for connecting to the resourced based virtual community when selected by the user."

However, Dinan discloses "the client side software also provides a context menu installable on the user's browser operable for connecting to the resourced based virtual community when selected by the user" (paragraph [0039]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman and Dinan because using the steps of "the client side software also provides a context menu installable on the user's browser operable for connecting to the resourced based virtual community when selected by the user" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing the user to become more involved in the community due to improvements in the user experience. This gives the user the advantage of a faster and more complete experience.

As per claim 89,

Pearlman does not explicitly indicate "the client side software is installed manually by the user or automatically when the user accesses the resource."

However, Dinan discloses "the client side software is installed manually by the user or automatically when the user accesses the resource" (paragraph [0008]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman and Dinan because using the steps of “the client side software is installed manually by the user or automatically when the user accesses the resource” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing the user to become more involved in the community due to improvements in the user experience. This gives the user the advantage of a faster and more complete experience.

As per claim 90,

Pearlman does not explicitly indicate “the client side software is operable to display a virtual community page displayed in a separate frame, popup window or balloon window along with the main resource.”

However, Dinan discloses “the client side software is operable to display a virtual community page displayed in a separate frame, popup window or balloon window along with the main resource” (paragraph [0046]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman and Dinan because using the steps of “the client side software is operable to display a virtual community page displayed in a separate frame, popup window or balloon window along with the main resource” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing the user to become more involved in the community due to improvements in the user

experience. This gives the user the advantage of a faster and more complete experience.

As per claim 91,

Pearlman does not explicitly indicate "the client side software is a standalone software agent."

However, Dinan discloses "the client side software is a standalone software agent" (paragraph [0062]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman and Dinan because using the steps of "the client side software is a standalone software agent" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing the user to become more involved in the community due to improvements in the user experience. This gives the user the advantage of a faster and more complete experience.

As per claim 92,

Pearlman does not explicitly indicate "the client side software is operable to discover current web resources accessed by the user by monitoring web requests from browsers."

However, Dinan discloses "the client side software is operable to discover current web resources accessed by the user by monitoring web requests from browsers" (paragraph [0008]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman and Dinan because using the steps of “the client side software is operable to discover current web resources accessed by the user by monitoring web requests from browsers” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing the user to become more involved in the community due to improvements in the user experience. This gives the user the advantage of a faster and more complete experience.

As per claim 93,

Pearlman does not explicitly indicate “the client side software is operable to detect the current resource being used by hooking into the protocol handling chain, or using a protocol filter, a kernel driver, or a customized content handler; or by listening to the system or windows event from browsers, or hooking into process, system and network APIs.”

However, Dinan discloses “the client side software is operable to detect the current resource being used by hooking into the protocol handling chain, or using a protocol filter, a kernel driver, or a customized content handler; or by listening to the system or windows event from browsers, or hooking into process, system and network APIs” (paragraph [0008]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman and Dinan because using the steps of “the client side software is operable to detect the current resource being used by hooking

Art Unit: 2168

into the protocol handling chain, or using a protocol filter, a kernel driver, or a customized content handler; or by listening to the system or windows event from browsers, or hooking into process, system and network APIs" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing the user to become more involved in the community due to improvements in the user experience. This gives the user the advantage of a faster and more complete experience.

As per claim 94,

Pearlman does not explicitly indicate "the client side software is a browser."

However, Dinan discloses "the client side software is a browser" (paragraph [0008]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman and Dinan because using the steps of "the client side software is a browser" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing the user to become more involved in the community due to improvements in the user experience. This gives the user the advantage of a faster and more complete experience.

As per claim 95,

Pearlman does not explicitly indicate "the client side software is operable to make multiple connections to multiple virtual communities based on multiple resources the

Art Unit: 2168

user is accessing and thus enabling users to participate in multiple communities simultaneously.”

However, Dinan discloses “the client side software is operable to make multiple connections to multiple virtual communities based on multiple resources the user is accessing and thus enabling users to participate in multiple communities simultaneously” (paragraph [0008]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman and Dinan because using the steps of “the client side software is operable to make multiple connections to multiple virtual communities based on multiple resources the user is accessing and thus enabling users to participate in multiple communities simultaneously” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing the user to become more involved in the community due to improvements in the user experience. This gives the user the advantage of a faster and more complete experience.

As per claim 96,

Pearlman does not explicitly indicate “the client side software is a browser plugin integrated in a user's existing web browser.”

However, Dinan discloses “the client side software is a browser plugin integrated in a user's existing web browser” (paragraph [0042]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman and Dinan because using the steps of “the

client side software is a browser plugin integrated in a user's existing web browser” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing the user to become more involved in the community due to improvements in the user experience. This gives the user the advantage of a faster and more complete experience.

As per claim 97,

Pearlman does not explicitly indicate “the browser plugin includes browser helper objects, plugins, applets, Javascript, flash, ActiveX object, content, dynamic html, connection or protocol filters and any other type of software extension.” (paragraph [0008])

However, Dinan discloses “the browser plugin includes browser helper objects, plugins, applets, Javascript, flash, ActiveX object, content, dynamic html, connection or protocol filters and any other type of software extension” (paragraph [0008]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman and Dinan because using the steps of “the browser plugin includes browser helper objects, plugins, applets, Javascript, flash, ActiveX object, content, dynamic html, connection or protocol filters and any other type of software extension” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing the user to become more involved in the community due to improvements in the user experience. This gives the user the advantage of a faster and more complete experience.

As per claim 98

Pearlman does not explicitly indicate “the client side software can be a special component, shared object, dynamic library, driver or other extensions.”

However, Dinan discloses “the client side software can be a special component, shared object, dynamic library, driver or other extensions” (paragraph [0046]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman and Dinan because using the steps of “the client side software can be a special component, shared object, dynamic library, driver or other extensions” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing the user to become more involved in the community due to improvements in the user experience. This gives the user the advantage of a faster and more complete experience.

As per claim 99,

Pearlman does not explicitly indicate “the client side software is operable to detect the current software used by the user and then connect to the associated virtual community based on that resource.”

However, Dinan discloses “the client side software is operable to detect the current software used by the user and then connect to the associated virtual community based on that resource” (paragraph [0046]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman and Dinan because using the steps of “the client side software is operable to detect the current software used by the user and then connect to the associated virtual community based on that resource” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing the user to become more involved in the community due to improvements in the user experience. This gives the user the advantage of a faster and more complete experience.

As per claim 100,

Pearlman does not explicitly indicate “the client side software is statically or dynamically linked to a software resource and operable to run along with the software resource when the software resource is started by the user.”

However, Dinan discloses “the client side software is statically or dynamically linked to a software resource and operable to run along with the software resource when the software resource is started by the user” (paragraph [0050]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman and Dinan because using the steps of “the client side software is statically or dynamically linked to a software resource and operable to run along with the software resource when the software resource is started by the user” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing the user to become more involved in the community due to improvements in

Art Unit: 2168

the user experience. This gives the user the advantage of a faster and more complete experience.

As per claim 101,

Pearlman does not explicitly indicate "the client side software resides the software resource to provide new functions, features, services and applications."

However, Dinan discloses "the client side software resides the software resource to provide new functions, features, services and applications" (paragraph [0046]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman and Dinan because using the steps of "the client side software resides the software resource to provide new functions, features, services and applications" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing the user to become more involved in the community due to improvements in the user experience. This gives the user the advantage of a faster and more complete experience.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record, listed on form PTO-892, and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jay A. Morrison whose telephone number is (571) 272-7112. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tim Vo can be reached on (571) 272-3642. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



TIM VO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Jay Morrison
TC2100

Tim Vo
TC2100